



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/019,833	11/20/2002	Anil B. Mukherjee	4239-61375	8664		
24197 75	24197 7590 06/29/2006		EXAMINER			
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP 121 SW SALMON STREET SUITE 1600 PORTLAND, OR 97204			KIM, YU	KIM, YUNSOO		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1644			
			DATE MAILED: 06/29/2006	DATE MAILED: 06/29/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · ·		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/019,83	33	MUKHERJEE ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Yunsoo K		1644				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CI SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by the period by the Office later than three months after the red patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THE TRANSPORT	HIS COMMUNICATION ent, however, may a reply be tim Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE	I. tely filed the mailing date of this c (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
·	•							
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-46</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)□	6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7)	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>1-46</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
Attachmen								
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date								
3) 🔲 Infon	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S r No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		O-152)			

C

Application/Control Number: 10/019,833 Page 2

Art Unit: 1644

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-46 are pending.

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-8, 18-23 and 36 -38, drawn to a method of preventing or treating IgA mediated autoimmune disorders.

Group II, claim(s) 9-17, drawn to a method of screening for a derivative, mimetic or variant of uteroglobin.

Group III, claim(s) 24-26, drawn to a method of predicting susceptibility to IgA nepropathy.

Group IV, claim(s) 27-29, drawn to a method of diagnosing IgA nepropathy.

Group V, claim(s) 30-35, drawn to a method of detecting a predisposition to developing asthma.

Group VI, claim(s) 39-46, drawn to a composition for use in inhibiting or treating IgA mediated disorder.

The inventions listed as Groups I-VI do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reason:

The inventions of Groups I -VI were found to have no special technical feature that defined the contribution over the prior art of WO 98/53846 (IDS Ref.)

The '846 publication teaches a method for treating or preventing an inflammatory condition in a patient with a composition comprising uteroglobin (claims 23-41, in particular) and a pharmaceutical composition comprising uteroglobin (claims 1-13, in particular). The inflammatory condition includes asthma and nepropathy. Therefore, the '846 publication anticipates the claimed method and composition as in claims 1-5, 36-38 and 39-46 of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1644

Since Applicant's inventions do not contribute a special technical feature when viewed over the prior art, or meet key critical elements, they do not have a single general inventive concept and so lack unity of invention.

3. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows: if Group I or VI is elected, Applicant is further required to elect a specific method of treating a specific condition or disease as recited in claims 2, 36 and 40.

The species are independent or distinct because the diseases differ with respect to their etiologies, the patient populations involved, and their therapeutic endpoints; thus each specific method of treating the specific disease represents patentably distinct subject matter. Currently, claims 1-2, 4-9 are generic for Group I and claims 39, 40, 42-46 are generic for Group VI.

4. Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/019,833

Art Unit: 1644

6. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Page 4

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

- 7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 8. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to

Application/Control Number: 10/019,833 Page 5

Art Unit: 1644

do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yunsoo Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-3176. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F,9-5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Yunsoo Kim
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600
June 21, 2006

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

1stmaClian